

Portland Harbor FS Team

FS Review Working Session – Draft Agenda

Tuesday-Wednesday, June 12-13, 2012
Portland EPA office
9AM - 4PM Each Day

Meeting Goals

- Share preliminary findings based on FS review to date
 1. What are the big issues?
 2. What are we really worried about?
- Define objectives for FS from standpoint of agency decision makers
- Identify key portions of FS that are:
 - 1) Acceptable for use in decision making;
 - 2) Unacceptable for use in decision making;
 - 3) May be useful (with list of actions necessary to make determination)
- Identify additional resources necessary to complete review

Key Elements of FS

- SMA by SMA review, prioritized list – plan to discuss 3-4 in this order
 1. River Mile 11 East (RM11E)
 2. Arkema
 3. Gunderson – RM8.5W
 4. Swan Island Lagoon
 5. Gasco/Siltronics
 6. International Slip RM4E

7. Oregon Steel Mills – RM2E

8. Willamette Cove – RM7E

- Characterization of SMAs – Summaries, maps to be developed for distribution to group prior to meeting

1. Conceptual Site Model

- Sources, upstream COCs, outfalls, groundwater, TZW

2. Adequacy of delineation of AOPCs, SMAs, subSMAs

- Appropriateness of water/land use assumptions – existing and future

3. Adequacy of indicator COCs wrt defining SMAs

- RAL/Alternative Area Comparison
- Integrated vs. Removal
 - Area comparisons
 - Volume comparisons
 - Post action SWACs
- Depth of impact estimation
- Other COCs summary – min, max, mean, count, detects, surface vs. depth
 - Within Alt B footprint
 - Within AOPC overall

4. Existences of principal threat areas within AOPC/SMA/Alternative footprints

- Criteria needs to be set first, eg:
 - HQ>100
 - Increased Cancer Risk > 10-3

- Site wide discussion

1. Characterization of Portland Harbor wrt MNR and deposition

- Model output
 - Bathymetry
 - Sediment grainsize distribution
2. Characterization of risks/impacts to harbor
- Appropriateness of averaging areas
 - Time zero vs. modeled time criteria
 - Impact of source controls and time to implement
 - Extreme events, prop wash impacts on MNR predictions
 - Land/water use designations – existing, future, planned use and navigational dredging, dockage, habitat creation, bridges, utilities
3. Engineering assumptions
- Dredge recontamination potential
 - Fish window
 - Sediment/contaminant resuspension controls
 - Production rates
 - Depth of impact/remediation
 - Cap effectiveness
 - Costs
 - Overall alternative comparability
 - Unit rates
 - Contingencies and discount rates
4. Nine criteria evaluation/weighting decision support system

Conclusions/Next Steps

- Summary of work session conclusions
 1. Components of FS that are acceptable for decision making
 2. Components of FS that need more detailed review to be acceptable
 - Actions to be taken
 - Timeline
 - Responsible person(s)
 3. Components of FS that are not useful in decision making and should not be reviewed
 - Justification
 4. Components of FS that are missing
 - Actions to be taken
 - Timeline
 - Responsible persons
- Next steps
 1. Identify milestones/deliverables
 2. Progress calls/meetings
 3. Summary of status/approach for:
 - Stakeholders
 - Management
 - LWG